

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, and 16-22 have been amended. Reconsideration of the action mailed September 26, 2003, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-12, 14, 15, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,360,037 ("Riza").

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 22, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,178,044 ("Li").

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riza in view of Li.

The Examiner objected to claims 24 and 27 as being dependant upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 24 and 27.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, and 16-22 for clarification and to provide clearer antecedent basis. No new matter is added.

Section 102(e) rejections

Claim 1 was rejected by the Examiner as anticipated by Riza. Applicant respectfully submits that Riza fails to disclose elements of claim 1. Claim 1 recites "a switching component group including a singular polarization switch" that when disabled will "pass one or more light beams exiting from the first component group with a first chosen polarization and reintroduce to the first component group the one or more light beams with the first chosen polarization without changing the polarization of the one or more light beams." Riza does not disclose a singular polarization switch that, when disabled, does not change the polarization of one or more light beams.

In Riza, a polarization switch is disclosed that requires at least two switching modules that change the polarization of incoming and outgoing light beams regardless of the switch

operation. The Examiner cites FIGS. 3a and 3b as well as the corresponding description in columns 4 through 9 as disclosing the optical switch of claim 1. FIGS. 3a and 3b illustrate an optical switch in exchanging and non-exchanging states respectively. Switching modules 24a and 24b each include a liquid crystal switching device 24, which changes the polarization of part of the light beams passing through the switching device. In both the exchanging and non-exchanging states, the switches 24a and 24b change the polarization of some portion of the light beams. Therefore, Riza does not disclose a 2x2 optical switch that includes a singular polarization switch that does not change the polarization of the light beams when the switch is disabled. Because Riza does not disclose elements of claim 1, Riza does not anticipate claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-8 which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 21 were rejected by the Examiner as anticipated by Riza. Claims 9 and 21 recite “a singular polarization switch.” As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Riza does not teach or suggest an optical switch that includes a singular polarization switch. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 21, as well as claims 10-19 which depend from claim 9, are in condition for allowance.

Section 102(a) rejections

Claim 20 was rejected by the Examiner as anticipated by Li. Applicant respectfully submits that Li fails to disclose elements of claim 20. Claim 20 includes “a singular polarization switch.” Li does not disclose a singular polarization switch. Li provides an optical circulator. The optical circulator is a steady state device which routes all incoming light at port one to port two and all incoming light at port two to port three. The two optical paths remain constant and no switching occurs. Therefore, Li does not teach or suggest a singular polarization switch. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is in condition of allowance.

Section 103(a) rejections

Applicant : Wei-Zhong Li
Serial No. : 10/075,657
Filed : February 12, 2002
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 13854-006001

Claims 5 and 13 were rejected by the Examiner as unpatentable over Riza in view of Li. Claims 5 and 13 recite "wherein the singular polarization switch includes a Faraday rotator modulated by a magnetic field." As discussed above, Riza does not teach or suggest an optical switch that includes a singular polarization switch. In Riza, at least two polarization switches are required to create an optical switch. Further, Li does not include any polarization switches. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 13 are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$110 check for a one-month extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2004



Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071